No NECESSITY

41

To ALTER the

COMMON-PRAYER;

OR, THE

UNREASONABLENESS

OF THE

New Separation,

Being a full ANSWER to Two late Books; the one called, *Reaſons for Reſtoring ſome Prayers and Directions*, &c. and the other, *The Defence of the Reaſons*.

In a LETTER to a Friend who has left the Communion of the Church of *England*.

Φιλόνεικοι ἐστε, ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ ζηλωταὶ περὶ μὴ ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν. Clemens ad Corinth.

LONDON;

Printed and Sold by *John Morphew* near *Stationers-Hall*.

1718. (Price Six Pence.)

SIR,

WHAT you propoſe as Terms of Communion, I freely own are *deſideranda*; and ſhould be heartily glad to have them, and many other valuable Uſages of the ancient Church, reſtor'd in a regular Way. But then I can't ſee that they are abſolutely neceſſary, and ſo Eſſential to the Being of a Church, as you are pleas'd to make them. Could they be prov'd Fundamentals, I grant that we ought to break thro' all Conſiderations whatever for them: But if this can't be done, I know not how you can juſtify your late Conduct. For I reckon the Peace of the Church to be of ſuch vaſt Moment, that nothing can excuſe our diſturbing it, but the Preſervation of Fundamentals. That the mix'd Cup, Prayers for the Dead, The Prayer for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, and the Oblatory Prayer, which are the Points you labour ſo hard for, are not ſuch, I think may be eaſily prov'd.

And here I ſhall begin with the mixing Water and Wine in the *Euchariſtick* Cup, which to me ſeems only a Point of Diſcipline, and has no relation to the Faith of the Church. If it be a Point of Diſcipline, I think it comes within the Power of the Church. And had ſhe been pleas'd, by any poſitive Command, to forbid the Uſe of the Mixture, I ſhould think my ſelf guilty of a criminal Diſobedience in acting contrary to her Orders herein.

I confeſs ſhe ſeems to leave it *ad libitum ſacerdotis*, and that it appears, by her taking no notice of thoſe who uſe the Mixture, that ſhe has not been offended at it. But then I am perſwaded that if the few Clergy, who have followed this Practice, had at any time inſiſted upon the Neceſſity of it, and refus'd the Communion

of thoſe who celebrated in pure Wine, ſhe would ſoon have ſhown her Reſentment againſt them; and if ſhe has had any Authority at all, ſince the Reformation, (and who of her Sons dare deny it) I can't ſuppoſe that this would be a mere *brutum fulmen.*

It is very plain to thoſe, who are acquainted with the *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms, that they us'd Wine mingled with Water at the Celebration of the Paſſover; and it is probable that our Saviour made uſe of the ſame Mixture at his own Supper: But I can't ſee from hence, we can conclude the abſolute Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. For it is more certain that our Saviour made uſe of unleaven'd Bread, becauſe the *Jews* were oblig'd by a poſitive Command to put away the Leaven out of their Houſes, and whoſoever eat it was to be cut off from the Congregation of *Iſrael.* * Now, Sir, I think you are ſo far from inſiſting on the Neceſſity of uſing the *Azyma*, that you yourſelf conſecrate the *Euchariſt* in leaven'd Bread, notwithſtanding you have acknowledg'd more than once to me, that it was contrary to what our Saviour did. † But if it be ſo neceſſary to mix the Cup, becauſe it is preſum'd our Saviour did ſo; why ſhould not the ſame Reaſon make it as neceſſary, to conſecrate unleaven'd Bread? ſince we have better Grounds to believe, that he us'd the *Azyma*, than we have that he us'd the mix'd Cup? For I can't find that the *Jews* were oblig'd by any poſitive Law to mix Water with their Wine, at the *Paſchal* Feſtival: Beſides, Sir, if it be ſo neceſſary to follow our Saviour's Example, why do we conſecrate the Sacrament faſting, and in the Morning, ſince we have an undoubted Evidence, that after Supper he took the Cup?

Had our Saviour or his Apoſtles given us a poſitive Precept about the Matter, I muſt own we were indiſpenſably oblig'd to follow it exactly. But ſince it is plain they have not, I can't ſee from all that is urg'd from this Head, but that the Church has it in her Power to uſe her own Liberty.

---

* Numb. 12. 15, 19.

† Note, *The Perſon to whom this Letter was wrote, and the Author of the* Defence, *differ in this.*

I readily grant that the ancient Churches did moſt commonly make uſe of the mix'd Cup, and though *Juſtin Martyr* is the firſt that I can find, which mentions this Practice, yet I am apt to believe it was a general Cuſtom before the Time in which he flouriſh'd.

But then I don't ſee that this is a Proof of the abſolute Neceſſity of it: Becauſe there were a great many other Cuſtoms us'd in that Time, which the Church has been pleas'd to alter ſince.

When the learned and ingenuous Author of the *Reaſons* firſt publiſh'd his Book, I did not know there were any that inſiſted on the abſolute Neceſſity of theſe Things. 'Tis the Neceſſity, and not the Reaſonableneſs of reſtoring them, that I deny; and notwithſtanding the artful Management of this great Author, I hope to make it appear that he is miſtaken in this Point.

It is with ſome Reluctancy that I undertake this Matter, after a learned and valuable Author has already done it, to the Satisfaction of the main Body of the Church of *England*. However, ſince there are ſome who are not convinc'd by his Arguments, and others who ſeem to be in ſuſpence, upon the Credit of the great Author of the *Reaſons*, who has thought it worth while to defend them with ſome Care and Labour: I hope I may be excus'd for medling in this Affair; becauſe it is poſſible, there may ſomething flow from a meaner Pen, that may be further uſeful. Beſides, I underſtand there are ſome who have been prejudic'd againſt the Author of the *No Reaſons*, upon a ſuſpicion that he is againſt the Lawfulneſs of theſe Things, could they be reſtored by a proper, and competent Authority. Now, Sir, as I have declar'd, that I think them not only Lawful, but reckon them among the *deſideranda* of our Church, I may be leſs liable to the Prejudice of ſome Perſons.

Your learned Advocate produces ſeveral Fathers, which he thinks fully prove the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. I ſhall therefore endeavour to ſhew that his Inſtances don't come up to his Purpoſe. And ſhall begin with *Juſtin Martyr*, which is the firſt Perſon he cites, and indeed could cite, upon this Occaſion.

Juſtin in his Apology for the Chriſtians, to the Emperor *Antoninus* and his Sons, *&c.* informs them of the

of thoſe who celebrated in pure Wine, ſhe would ſoon have ſhown her Reſentment againſt them; and if ſhe has had any Authority at all, ſince the Reformation, (and who of her Sons dare deny it) I can't ſuppoſe that this would be a mere *brutum fulmen.*

It is very plain to thoſe, who are acquainted with the *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms, that they us'd Wine mingled with Water at the Celebration of the Paſſover; and it is probable that our Saviour made uſe of the ſame Mixture at his own Supper: But I can't ſee from hence, we can conclude the abſolute Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. For it is more certain that our Saviour made uſe of unleaven'd Bread, becauſe the *Jews* were oblig'd by a poſitive Command to put away the Leaven out of their Houſes, and whoſoever eat it was to be cut off from the Congregation of *Iſrael.* * Now, Sir, I think you are ſo far from inſiſting on the Neceſſity of uſing the *Azyma*, that you yourſelf conſecrate the *Euchariſt* in leaven'd Bread, notwithſtanding you have acknowledg'd more than once to me, that it was contrary to what our Saviour did. † But if it be ſo neceſſary to mix the Cup, becauſe it is preſum'd our Saviour did ſo; why ſhould not the ſame Reaſon make it as neceſſary, to conſecrate unleaven'd Bread? ſince we have better Grounds to believe, that he us'd the *Azyma*, than we have that he us'd the mix'd Cup? For I can't find that the *Jews* were oblig'd by any poſitive Law to mix Water with their Wine, at the *Paſchal* Feſtival: Beſides, Sir, if it be ſo neceſſary to follow our Saviour's Example, why do we conſecrate the Sacrament faſting, and in the Morning, ſince we have an undoubted Evidence, that after Supper he took the Cup?

Had our Saviour or his Apoſtles given us a poſitive Precept about the Matter, I muſt own we were indiſpenſably oblig'd to follow it exactly. But ſince it is plain they have not, I can't ſee from all that is urg'd from this Head, but that the Church has it in her Power to uſe her own Liberty.

---

* Numb. 12. 15, 19.

† Note, *The Perſon to whom this Letter was wrote, and the Author of the* Defence, *differ in this.*

I readily grant that the ancient Churches did moſt commonly make uſe of the mix'd Cup, and though *Juſtin Martyr* is the firſt that I can find, which mentions this Practice, yet I am apt to believe it was a general Cuſtom before the Time in which he flouriſh'd.

But then I don't ſee that this is a Proof of the abſolute Neceſſity of it: Becauſe there were a great many other Cuſtoms us'd in that Time, which the Church has been pleas'd to alter ſince.

When the learned and ingenuous Author of the *Reaſons* firſt publiſh'd his Book, I did not know there were any that inſiſted on the abſolute Neceſſity of theſe Things. 'Tis the Neceſſity, and not the Reaſonableneſs of reſtoring them, that I deny; and notwithſtanding the artful Management of this great Author, I hope to make it appear that he is miſtaken in this Point.

It is with ſome Reluctancy that I undertake this Matter, after a learned and valuable Author has already done it, to the Satisfaction of the main Body of the Church of *England*. However, ſince there are ſome who are not convinc'd by his Arguments, and others who ſeem to be in ſuſpence, upon the Credit of the great Author of the *Reaſons*, who has thought it worth while to defend them with ſome Care and Labour: I hope I may be excus'd for medling in this Affair; becauſe it is poſſible, there may ſomething flow from a meaner Pen, that may be further uſeful. Beſides, I underſtand there are ſome who have been prejudic'd againſt the Author of the *No Reaſons*, upon a ſuſpicion that he is againſt the Lawfulneſs of theſe Things, could they be reſtored by a proper, and competent Authority. Now, Sir, as I have declar'd, that I think them not only Lawful, but reckon them among the *deſideranda* of our Church, I may be leſs liable to the Prejudice of ſome Perſons.

Your learned Advocate produces ſeveral Fathers, which he thinks fully prove the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. I ſhall therefore endeavour to ſhew that his Inſtances don't come up to his Purpoſe. And ſhall begin with *Juſtin Martyr*, which is the firſt Perſon he cites, and indeed could cite, upon this Occaſion.

Juſtin in his Apology for the Chriſtians, to the Emperor *Antoninus* and his Sons, *&c.* informs them of the

the Doctrine, Manners and Ceremonies of the firſt Chriſtians. And here his Deſign was not to ſhew that all theſe Cuſtoms were neceſſary, but that they were no ways injurious to the Empire; and that therefore they did not deſerve ſo ſevere Puniſhments as were uſually inflicted on the Practiſers of them.

The Chriſtians of his Time were charg'd with holding obſcene and lewd Aſſemblies, with eating human Fleſh, *&c.* The holy Martyr, I preſume, upon this ſcore gives the Emperor a particular Account of the Behaviour of the Chriſtians, without leaving out any Ceremony at all, that they practis'd. When our Prayers are ended, ſays he, * we ſalute one another with a Kiſs. Afterwards Bread and a Cup of Water and *mix'd Wine* is brought to him, that is ſet over the Brethren, and when he has taken them he returns Praiſe and Glory to the Father of the Univerſe, thro' the Name of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; and makes a long Thankſgiving, for that he has vouchſafed theſe Things to us. And when he has finiſh'd his Prayers and Thankſgiving, all the People that are preſent ſhew their Approbation, by ſaying, with a loud Voice, *Amen.* When the Preſident has thus given Thanks, and the People have ſignified their joyful Aſſent, then they, whom we call Deacons, diſtribute to every one preſent, that they may partake of the *Euchariſtick* Bread, and Wine and Water, and they carry them to thoſe that are abſent.

I have literally tranſlated theſe Paſſages out of the holy Martyr, becauſe ſome have thought the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup may be infer'd from hence. Now, Sir, I can't ſee but we may as well prove the Neceſſity of the *Oſculum ſanctum*, and of carrying the *Euchariſt* to private Houſes, which I don't find you fond of reſtoring, tho' it was a Cuſtom for many Ages, and is even retain'd by the greater Number of Chriſtian Churches to this very Day. However, Sir, ſhould the Whim take ſome People, to think theſe Cuſtoms neceſſary to be reſtor'd, yet there is another Uſage men-

* Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῆς εὐχῆς, &c. Apolog. 2. *Pag.* 97. *Edit.* Pariſ. 1636.

tion'd

tion'd by this Father which I believe you won't be fond of, and that is the ποτήριον ὕδατος, the Cup of Water which was offer'd to the Prieſt. This Cup I take to be different from the κεῖμα, the Cup of mix'd Wine which was offer'd to him, and I am apt to think it was conſecrated for ſome other Uſe than the Service of the Altar. Tho' why it ſhould be ſanctified to waſh the Prieſts Hands, I can ſee no Reaſon for. * It was uſual indeed for the Deacon to bring a Veſſel of Water to the Biſhop, or Prieſts, officiating at the Altar, to waſh their Hands before the Communion Service. But then I don't find that they conſecrated it for this Purpoſe; whereas the Water mention'd by this Father was ſolemnly conſecrated, and given to the People for ſome religious Uſe. It is probable it was deſign'd for the ſame purpoſe as the ἁγιασμὸς, † or *aqua benedicta* of the *Greeks*. And there is ſomething like it practis'd in moſt of the Churches that adhere to the *Roman* Communion to this very Day.

Before I leave this Father, I think it convenient, to take notice of an ambiguous Paſſage, in the Author of the *Defence* || that may probably enſnare the unlearned or unwary Reader: The Paſſage is this. *He acquaints the Emperour, that the Deacons gave all the Congregation part of the Bread, and Wine and Water, which was Euchariſtiz'd, or bleſt by Conſecration, and then adds, that the Apoſtles were commanded by our Saviour, to celebrate in the ſame Manner: And if ſo, the Mixture in the Sacramental Cup could not be unknown to the Apoſtles.* Now, one would be apt to conclude from theſe Paragraphs, that *Juſtin Matyr* intimates, that our Saviour commanded the Apoſtles to celebrate the *Euchariſtical* Cup mingled with Wine and Water. Whereas the Father ſays nothing like it. For, after having told the Emperour *&c.* that they call'd this Food the Euchariſt, and that it was not lawful for any to partake of it, but thoſe who believ'd their Doctrine to be true, and were baptiz'd: He goes on, *For we do not receive this as common Bread, nor common Drink; but as our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt being made Fleſh by the Word of God,*

---

* Vide *Defence p.* 4. † Vide Goar. Eucholog. *p.* 453. || *Page* 4.

had

*had Fleſh and Blood for the ſake of our Salvation: So in like manner we have been taught, that that Food, which has been Euchariſtiz'd, or bleſt by the Prayer of the Word that comes from him, from which Food we are nouriſh'd, by its paſſing into our Subſtance, is the Fleſh * and Blood, of that Incarnate Jeſus. For ſo the Apoſtles in their Commentaries, which are call'd Goſpels, have delivered that Jeſus commanded them (to teach) that he having taken Bread when he had given Thanks, did ſay, Do this in remembrance of me: This is my Body. And likewiſe, that he having taken the Cup and given Thanks, did ſay, This is my Blood: And that he gave the* Euchariſt *to them alone.*

Now, Sir, I think it is plain that the Father doth not ſuggeſt, that our Saviour commanded the Apoſtles to mix Wine and Water in the Sacramental Cup, but only, that our Saviour order'd them, to teach that the *Euchariſt* was his Fleſh and Blood, and to make known the Form he made uſe of, and that he adminiſtred it only to them. This, Sir, I hope you will own, doth not make for your purpoſe.

In ſhort, Sir, we have no more from this Father than a bare Relation of the Chriſtians uſual Practice in his Time: Here is no Reaſon given for the Mixture, nor the leaſt intimation of its being neceſſary.

The next Father, which your Author thinks will prove the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup, is *Irenæus*, who ſays, *accipiens panem ſuum corpus eſſe confitebatur, & temperamentum calicis ſuum ſanguinem confirmavit.* † *Taking Bread he declar'd it to be his Body; and the Mixture of the Cup he affirm'd was his Blood.* And in another place, *Quando ergo & mixtus Calix, & fractus panis percipit verbum Dei, fit Euchariſtia Sanguinis & Corporis Chriſti.* ‖ *When therefore the mix'd Cup and broken Bread, partakes of the Word of God, it becomes the* Euchariſt *of the Blood and Body of Chriſt.*

---

* Ἐκείνῃ τῇ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, ὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντεταλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε· &c. Apol. 2. p. 9

† Adverſus Hæreſes. Lib. 4. Cap. 57.

‖ Lib. 5. Cap. 2.

The

Theſe Paſſages, I own, ſeem to ſhew the Uſe of the mix'd Cup in his Time, but I can't ſee how they prove the abſolute Neceſſity of it. For it is evident that he only accidentally Mentions the *Temperamentum Calicis*, and *mixtus calix*: (which were uſual Phraſes, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter, to ſignify the common Cup that was drank) And that his Argument was levell'd againſt the *Marcionites*, *Valentinians*, &c.

Could the uſing of mere Wine in the *Euchariſtical* Sacrifice, be prov'd to be Part of the Charge againſt thoſe abominable Hereticks; I grant the Argument would be good againſt thoſe that refuſe the mix'd Cup. But I believe this won't be attempted. And therefore I think there can be no fair Pretence to infer the abſolute Neceſſity of mixing Wine and Water, from theſe Paſſages.

There are two other Paſſages of this Father which the Author of the *Defence* has added, to ſtrengthen (as he thinks) his Argument. The firſt is againſt the *Ebionites*. *Reprobant itaque hi Commiſtionem vini cæleſtis, & ſola aqua Sæcularis volunt eſſe, non recipientes Deum ad ſuam mixturam.** Here I muſt beg leave to ſay, that the Author has miſconſtrued theſe Words, and miſtaken their Senſe.

He conſtrues them thus: *That they rejected the Mixture of the heavenly Wine, and only made uſe of Water.* Whereas the plain and genuine Conſtruction, I humbly conceive, ſhould be after this manner. *Therefore theſe reject the Mixture of the heavenly Wine; and will be only worldly Water, not receiving God according to his Mixture.*

The Expreſſions are Allegorical, and relate to a former Paſſage of this Father, where he ſays the *Ebionites* deny the Union of the divine and human Nature, † *&c.* I forbear to ſay any thing more upon it, becauſe I am perſwaded that the judicious Author of the *Defence*, upon a review of the Chapter, will acknowledge that this Paſſage doth not relate to the holy *Euchariſt*.

The other Quotation, I think, will be as little ſerviceable to his Purpoſe. *Hæc enim & Dominus docuit, mix-*

---

* Lib. 5. Cap. 1. † Ebionæi, Unitionem Dei & Hominis per fidem non recipientes in ſuam animam; ſed in veteri generationis perſeverantes fermento, *&c. Ibid.*

tionem calicis novam in regno, cum diſcipulis habiturum ſe pollicitus. * I ſhall add the next Paragraph, becauſe it gives the Reader ſome light into the meaning of the Father. *Et Apoſtolus autem liberam futuram creaturam à ſervitute corruptelæ, in libertatem gloriæ filiorum Dei, confeſſus eſt.* The Father had been treating in ſeveral Chapters before, and more particularly in this, of the Reſurrection and *Millennium.* † This Doctrine, he ſays, our Saviour taught, when he promis'd that he would have with his Diſciples a new Mixture of the Cup in his Kingdom. Whether the Notion of Chriſt's Reign upon Earth for a Thouſand Years, which the Church of *England* has condemn'd, || be True or Falſe, I think I need not at preſent concern my ſelf about. I am ſure it is not neceſſary to believe it, tho' this Father pleads Tradition for it, * a much ſtronger Tradition than can be brought for the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. I ſhall only obſerve, that this new Mixture which, he ſays, our Saviour will drink in the *Millenium*, is not the Sacramental Cup, but the common Drink, which ſhall be then made uſe of.

It was the uſual Cuſtom in hot Countries, to put Water to the Wine when they drank it; becauſe it made it much more Pleaſant: And from thence came that Saying, *Miſceto poculum*, which is the ſame as fill a Glaſs in *Engliſh*.

That *miſcere*, τὸ κεράσαι, &c. to Mingle, doth uſually ſignify to give one Drink is very plain from the beſt Authorities of the Ancients. Thus in *Homer*, κέρασσε δ' οἴνοιο ἐρυθρόν. *Fill ſome red Wine*; and in *Cicero*, *alteri*

---

* Lib. 5. Cap. 36.

† Note, *This Father believed that the Juſt, after having reign'd with Jeſus Chriſt on Earth, for the ſpace of a Thouſand Years, and enjoy'd temporal Pleaſures, ſhould enter into Heaven to poſſeſs eternal Happineſs; which Notion he might probably receive from* Papias, Ariſtion, *and a certain Perſon call'd* John *the Elder.*

|| Qui Millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, ſacris literis adverſantur, & in Judaica delirimenta ſeſe præcipitant. *Edv. 6. Art.* 41. *Apud Sparrow.*

* Quando regnabunt Juſti: Quemadmodum Preſbyteri meminerunt, qui Johannem Diſcipulum Domini viderunt, audiſſe ſe ab eo. *Lib. 5. Cap. 33.*

miſcere

miſcere mulſum, is to the ſame purpoſe. *Ovid* calls the Cupbearer *qui pocula miſcet*, and *Juvenal* ſays, *Neſcit tot millibus emptus Pauperibus miſcere puer. He doth not know how to fill a Glaſs.* In ſhort, Sir, it is plain, that there was not always a real Mixture where the Words *miſceo*, κεράννυμι, *&c.* were us'd. So that I may fairly conclude, that *Irenæus* meant no more by the Mixture, than what we may in this Climate, fairly conſtrue Wine, and that we ought to underſtand him in the ſame Senſe, as we ſhould one of our Country-men, who uſing the ancient *Phraſeology*, ſays, *miſceto poculum.*

But after all, ſuppoſing the Father did really mean, that our Saviour in the *Millennium* would drink Wine and Water, yet I can't ſee that from hence we can deduce the Neceſſity of uſing it in the Sacrament.

It is my Opinion, that the Controverſy between Pope *Victor* and the *Aſiaticks*, about keeping of *Eaſter* was of far greater moment than the mix'd Cup; and yet this Father did not think theſe different Cuſtoms ought to break Communion; and therefore ſeverely reprehended the Raſhneſs of the Pope in excommunicating *Polycrates* and the reſt of the *Aſiaticks*, for not complying with him; telling him that his Anceſtors ſent the *Euchariſt* to thoſe Biſhops, who obſerv'd this Feſtival different from them. * And by the way, I think this is a Cuſtom that is grown out of date, and it is my Opinion you won't be fond of reviving it.

Clemens Alexandrinus is thought to be another unexceptionable Evidence for the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. *He ſays that Wine is proportionably mix'd with Water, but the Spirit is mix'd with Man.* † If theſe Expreſſions relate to the Sacrament, for it is doubtful whether they do; yet they by no means prove the *Neceſſity* of the κρᾶμα or Mixture, nor can you make them come up to your Purpoſe, put what Senſe you pleaſe upon them. He ſpeaks likewiſe of ſome other Mixtures, which I confeſs I do not underſtand; and treats

---

* Euſebius. *Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 24.

† Ἀναλόγως πίνυν κίρναται, ὁ μὲν οἶνος, τῷ ὕδατι, τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ, τὸ πνεῦμα. Pædag. *Lib.* 2.

tionem calicis novam in regno, cum diſcipulis habiturum ſe pollicitus. * I ſhall add the next Paragraph, becauſe it gives the Reader ſome light into the meaning of the Father. *Et Apoſtolus autem liberam futuram creaturam à ſervitute corruptelæ, in libertatem gloriæ filiorum Dei, confeſſus eſt.* The Father had been treating in ſeveral Chapters before, and more particularly in this, of the Reſurrection and *Millennium.* † This Doctrine, he ſays, our Saviour taught, when he promis'd that he would have with his Diſciples a new Mixture of the Cup in his Kingdom. Whether the Notion of Chriſt's Reign upon Earth for a Thouſand Years, which the Church of *England* has condemn'd, ‖ be True or Falſe, I think I need not at preſent concern my ſelf about. I am ſure it is not neceſſary to believe it, tho' this Father pleads Tradition for it, * a much ſtronger Tradition than can be brought for the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. I ſhall only obſerve, that this new Mixture which, he ſays, our Saviour will drink in the *Millenium*, is not the Sacramental Cup, but the common Drink, which ſhall be then made uſe of.

It was the uſual Cuſtom in hot Countries, to put Water to the Wine when they drank it; becauſe it made it much more Pleaſant: And from thence came that Saying, *Miſce to poculum*, which is the ſame as fill a Glaſs in *Engliſh*.

That *miſcere*, τὸ κεράσαι, &c. to Mingle, doth uſually ſignify to give one Drink is very plain from the beſt Authorities of the Ancients. Thus in *Homer*, κέρασσε δ' οἴνοιο ἐρυθρόν. *Fill ſome red Wine*; and in *Cicero*, *alteri*

---

* Lib. 5. Cap. 36.

† Note, *This Father believed that the Juſt, after having reign'd with Jeſus Chriſt on Earth, for the ſpace of a Thouſand Years, and enjoy'd temporal Pleaſures, ſhould enter into Heaven to poſſeſs eternal Happineſs; which Notion he might probably receive from* Papias, Ariſtion, *and a certain Perſon call'd* John *the Elder.*

‖ Qui Millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, ſacris literis adverſantur, & in Judaica delirimenta ſeſe precipitant. *Edw. 6. Art.* 41. *Apud Sparrow.*

* Quando regnabunt Juſti: Quemadmodum Preſbyteri meminerunt, qui Johannem Diſcipulum Domini viderunt, audiſſe ſe ab eo. *Lib. 5. Cap. 33.*

miſcere mulſum, is to the ſame purpoſe. *Ovid* calls the Cupbearer *qui pocula miſcet*, and *Juvenal* ſays, *Neſcit tot millibus emptus Pauperibus miſcere puer. He doth not know how to fill a Glaſs.* In ſhort, Sir, it is plain, that there was not always a real Mixture where the Words *miſceo*, κεράννυμι, *&c.* were us'd. So that I may fairly conclude, that *Irenæus* meant no more by the Mixture, than what we may in this Climate, fairly conſtrue Wine, and that we ought to underſtand him in the ſame Senſe, as we ſhould one of our Country-men, who uſing the ancient *Phraſeology*, ſays, *miſceto poculum.*

But after all, ſuppoſing the Father did really mean, that our Saviour in the *Millennium* would drink Wine and Water, yet I can't ſee that from hence we can deduce the Neceſſity of uſing it in the Sacrament.

It is my Opinion, that the Controverſy between Pope *Victor* and the *Aſiaticks*, about keeping of *Eaſter* was of far greater moment than the mix'd Cup; and yet this Father did not think theſe different Cuſtoms ought to break Communion; and therefore ſeverely reprehended the Raſhneſs of the Pope in excommunicating *Polycrates* and the reſt of the *Aſiaticks*, for not complying with him; telling him that his Anceſtors ſent the *Euchariſt* to thoſe Biſhops, who obſerv'd this Feſtival different from them. * And by the way, I think this is a Cuſtom that is grown out of date, and it is my Opinion you won't be fond of reviving it.

Clemens Alexandrinus is thought to be another unexceptionable Evidence for the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. *He ſays that Wine is proportionably mix'd with Water, but the Spirit is mix'd with Man.* † If theſe Expreſſions relate to the Sacrament, for it is doubtful whether they do; yet they by no means prove the *Neceſſity* of the κρᾶμα or Mixture, nor can you make them come up to your Purpoſe, put what Senſe you pleaſe upon them. He ſpeaks likewiſe of ſome other Mixtures, which I confeſs I do not underſtand; and treats

---

* Euſebius. *Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 24.

† Ἀναλόγως οἶνον κίρνατω, ὁ μὲν οἶνος, τῷ ὕδατι, τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ, τὸ πνεῦμα. Pædag. *Lib.* 2.

of the *Euchariſt* in ſuch allegorical and myſterious Terms, that no Man living, I believe, can find out what he means. I ſay no Man living: And my Reaſon is this, Becauſe he thought it not lawful to give a clear Account of it in Writing, but only by Word of Mouth, to thoſe who were thought worthy of the Communication. *

The Author of the *Defence*, indeed, makes him ſpeak clear, and full home to his Purpoſe, and had his Tranſlation been Juſt, we muſt have either given up this Father, or own'd our ſelves to be in a damnable Error. For he ſays, † that this Father *declares expreſly that the Logos, or Eternal Son of God, order'd the Blood of the Grape to be mix'd with Water, as his own Blood has Happineſs or Salvation incorporated with it.*

For my own part I muſt confeſs, that had this been a true Tranſlation, nothing could be fuller to your Purpoſe. For it is certain that God's Will, when known, muſt be binding, and we ought not to deviate from it, upon any Conſideration whatever. But then, Sir, I muſt beg leave to ſay, that the Tranſlation and the Original, are perfect Strangers; and had it not been for the Marginal Quotation, I ſhould have thought it to be taken from ſome Part of this Father's Works, which have not come to the View of the learned World.

I ſhall make bold to tranſlate the whole Paſſage, and what relates to it, in plain *Engliſh*. *Afterwards the holy Vine put forth a prophetick Bud. This is a Sign to thoſe who have been brought up out of Error to Reſt, to wit, the great Cluſter which is the* Logos, *that was preſs'd for us: The Divine* Logos *being willing to be mix'd with the Water of the Blood of the Grape, as his Blood is mingled with Salvation.* || *Hervetus* thinks that τῷ λόγῳ is to be join'd by appoſition with τῷ αἵματι· and then the

---

* *Vide* Stromat. *Lib.* 1. *p.* 275. & *Lib.* 4. *p.* 539. *Edit. Pariſ. Anno* 1641.

† *Page* 6.

|| Ἔπειτα ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἁγία τὸν βότρυν ἐβλάστησε τὸν προφητικὸν τοῦτο σημεῖον τοῖς εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν ἐκ τῆς πλάνης πεπαιδαγωγημένοις, ὁ μέγας βότρυς ὁ λόγος ὁ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν θλιβείς, τοῦ αἵματος τῆς σταφυλῆς ὕδατι κίρνασθαι ἐθελήσας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ, ὡς καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ σωτηρίας κίρναται. Pædagog. *Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 2.

Tranſla-

Tranſlation runs thus. *The Blood of the Grape, to wit, the Word, being willing to be mix'd with Water.* Now, Sir, Pray what can you collect for your Purpoſe, from theſe allegorical and dark Expreſſions, which no Commentator has, nor do I believe can, give us Light into. I aſſure you, Sir, here is no order from the Eternal Logos to mix the Blood of the Grape with Water. And had the learned Author of the *Defence* more carefully examin'd this Father, I am apt to believe he would have thought him of no great Service to his Deſign.

It is obſervable, that the Beauties of this Father lay in his moral Diſcourſes, and (as *Du Pin* ſays) he was a much better Philoſopher than a Divine. It is certain, he is ſo dark, and Enigmatical in ſome Points of Religion, that oftentimes no Argument can be fairly drawn from him to the Prejudice of any Antagoniſt.

It muſt be confeſs'd that St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks more home to your purpoſe, and warmly urges the Uſe of the mix'd Cup. But then I think it is plain, that St. *Cyprian* ſtands here by himſelf, as indeed he doth in ſome other Points. And where this happens, I think it my Duty to differ from him.

I acknowledge him as one of the greateſt Lights and Ornaments of the Church; and that his Authority has been eſtabliſh'd by her concurrent Suffrage in moſt things: But where the Church has left him, I think I may ſafely follow them.

It is not what one or two Fathers hold that obliges me, but what all of them, with one, and the ſame conſent, have openly, frequently, and perſeveringly held, writ, and taught: And I am perſwaded if we follow the excellent Rules, that are here and there laid down by *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, * we ſhall find it neceſ-

* Et quicquid non unus, aut duo tantùm, ſed omnes pariter, uno eodemque conſenſu, aperte, frequenter, perſeveranter, tenuiſſe, ſcripſiſſe, docuiſſe, cognoverit, id ſibi quoque intelligat abſque dubitatione credendum, &c. *Vin. Lirin. adverſ. Hæreſ. Cap.* 4.

Quicquid vero, quamvis ille ſanctus, & doctus, quamvis Epiſcopus, quamvis Confeſſor, & Martyr, præter omnes, aut contra omnes ſenſerit, id inter proprias & occultas & privatas opiniunculas, à communis, publicæ, ac generalis ſententiæ authoritate ſecretum ſit: *Cap.* 39.

ſary

ſary to forſake not only this, but every other Father ſince the firſt Century in ſome particular Points.

St. *Cyprian* has been juſtly ſtil'd the rigid Doctor of Diſcipline; and it muſt be own'd by all who are acquainted with his Writings, that he has treated ſome Points with ſuch a warmth as ſeems inconſiſtent with his profeſs'd, and practis'd Charity. I don't doubt but he thought the rebaptizing of thoſe Perſons, who had been baptiz'd by Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, was more neceſſary in it ſelf than the mix'd Cup. For his Endeavours to get the Rebaptization eſtabliſh'd were very laborious, as may be ſeen from ſeveral of his Epiſtles. Whereas it was but by accident, that he treated of the Mixture of Water and Wine in the Sacramental Cup, his main Deſign being againſt the *Aquarians*; or to convince thoſe Chriſtians who celebrated in pure Water, for fear of being diſcover'd by the Smell of the Wine, drank in the Euchariſtical Cup in the Morning. And yet tho' he ſo frequently, and ſo warmly urges the Neceſſity of baptizing thoſe Perſons who had been baptiz'd by Hereticks, he thinks the Peace and Unity of the Church infinitely more neceſſary, and that it ought not to be a Term of Communion. *Neminem Judicantes, nec à Jure communionis aliquem ſi diverſum ſenſerit, amoventes.* The Synod which was conven'd upon this Point, he ſays, would judge no Man, nor deny any one the Communion who was of a different Opinion. And in the latter end of his Epiſtle to *Jubaianus*, where he warmly manages the Argument: He ſays, *Hæc tibi breviter pro noſtrâ mediocritate reſcripſimus, frater cariſſime, nemini præſcribentes, aut præjudicantes, quo minus unuſquiſque Epiſcoporum, quod putat, faciat, habens arbitrii ſui liberam poteſtatem.* Here he declares that they would not lay a reſtraint on any; but that they left it to the liberty of every Biſhop to do as he pleas'd.

But ſuppoſing, Sir, that St. *Cyprian* had been ſo rigid for the mix'd Cup, as your ſelf; yet I think I may ſafely Anſwer you in this Caſe, as St. *Auſtin* did the *Donatiſts*, who urg'd this Father in another. *I am not bound by the Authority of this Epiſtle, becauſe I don't hold St.* Cyprian's *Letters to be Canonical, but I try them by thoſe*

thoſe that are Canonical, and whatever I find in them that is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, that I accept, and honour him for; but that which diſagrees with them, I refuſe without wounding his Memory. *

As fond as you are of St. *Cyprian*'s Sixty Third Epiſtle, (and I think it is the only one, that mentions any thing of the Caſe) yet I dare ſay, you won't defend all his Reaſonings for the mix'd Cup, nor do I believe you can think any of the Scriptures, he cites for it, are juſtly applicable to the Purpoſe. And if his Reaſonings and Quotations won't bear any weight, I ſee no reaſon why his bare Say-ſo ſhould alter my Judgment in this Matter.

If you think St. *Cyprian*'s bare Authority muſt needs out-ballance the Peace of the Church, let me tell you, there are ſome other things, beſides the baptizing of penitent Hereticks, that he calls neceſſary, which the Church of *England* has not practis'd ſince the Reformation. I ſhall mention one Cuſtom which you do not inſiſt on, and that is the Uſe of Chriſm. *It is alſo neceſſary,* ſays he, *that he that has been baptiz'd be anointed, that having the Chriſm, that is, Unction, he may be the Anointed of God, and have the Grace of Chriſt in himſelf.* † It is plain, he is as deciſive in this point, as he is in the mix'd Cup; and yet I don't find that you are pleas'd to impoſe the Neceſſity of Chriſm upon us.

Both theſe Cuſtoms are ancient, and I believe innocent and deſirable, and therefore (as *Du Pin* ſays) we are not to wonder if a Father ſpeaks of them as neceſſary things, without ſcrupulouſly examining whether they are of abſolute Neceſſity, taking them in a rigorous Senſe.

---

* Ego hujus Epiſtolæ authoritate non teneor, quia literas Cypriani non ut canonicas habeo, ſed eas ex canonicis conſidero, & quod in eis Divinarum Scripturarum authoritati congruit, cum laude ejus accipio: Quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus reſpuo: *Auguſt. contra Creſconium. Lib. 2. Tom. 7.*

† Ungi quoque neceſſe eſt eum, qui baptizatus ſit, ut accepto Chriſmate, id eſt, unctione, eſſe unctus Dei, & habere in ſe gratiam Chriſti poſſit. *Epiſt. 70. Edit. Oxon.*

As

As for the Argument that you draw from our Saviour's making Uſe of Wine and Water in Conformity to the *Jews* who did ſo at the Paſchal Feaſt; I think it is of no force againſt us. For I can't ſee how you can infer the indiſpenſable Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup from hence, unleſs you can prove a poſitive Command of God to the *Jewiſh* Church about this matter. *

The *Hebrew* Doctors ſay, It is all one, whether the Wine be pure or diluted, and I believe you will hardly find one, that ever declar'd that the Feſtival was imperfectly celebrated, where Water was not us'd. If therefore the Paſſover might be lawfully celebrated in pure Wine, tho' it was uſual for the *Jews* to mix it; I think it may be lawful to conſecrate the Euchariſt without the Mixture, and that your Argument only ſhews the Lawfulneſs, and not the Neceſſity of it.

The Apoſtolical Conſtitutions which your Author ſeems ſo fond of, do not ſhew the mix'd Cup to be abſolutely neceſſary. For all that is ſaid of this matter is in theſe Words. *And likewiſe having mix'd the Cup with Wine and Water.* †

But had they been ever ſo much to your purpoſe, I freely declare they are of no Weight and Authority with me: For it is plain, that the Author is an Impoſtour, that endeavours to paſs for a Diſciple of the Apoſtles, and imputes to them diverſe Ordinances, that were altogether unknown for many Years after their Deceaſe. Beſides, Sir, it is certain, that the Conſtitutions we have now are very different from what was extant in the Time of *Epiphanius*; || and 'tis very probable, they have been mightily corrupted by Hereticks of a latter Date. However, Sir, ſuppoſing them to be much Ancienter than they are, yet I know no reaſon, why

---

* *The Author of the* Defence *owns the Mixture not to be commanded by the Moſaick Inſtitution, and that it reſted moſtly upon Cuſtom*, p. 53.

† Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος. *Lib.* 8. *C.* 12.

|| Has Conſtitutiones Epiphanii ævo, ab hæreticis graviter depravatas, longe alias ab iis, quæ olim extiterunt, ac diverſas eſſe certiſſime conſtat, quod ex additionibus, truncationibus, & interpolationibus, facile contingere potuit. *Cave Hiſt. Liter. p.* 19. *Vol.* 1.

Vide etiam Beveregii. *Annot. in Can. Apoſt. Pandect. p.* 5.

the

they ſhould be more obligatory than the Conſtitutions of the Church of *England*.

The two Councils you ſo much boaſt of, I think will do you but little Service. For the Council of *Carthage* (which decrees that nothing be offer'd in the Holy Sacrament, but Bread and Wine mingled with Water; that nothing more than the Body and Blood of our Lord be offer'd, as he himſelf deliver'd it: *viz.* Bread and Wine mingled with Water) was but a Provincial Synod, and at moſt oblig'd no farther than the *African* Churches after it was taken into their Code.

The Author of the *Defence* * ſuppoſes the Synod thought the Mixture neceſſary; becauſe they ſay, our Lord deliver'd Wine mingled with Water. Hereupon he thinks he has gain'd a mighty Advantage: And is not (ſays he) ſo unanimous a Reſolution for the Neceſſity of the Mixture, is not the Teſtimony of a whole Synod conſiderable Evidence? To this I anſwer, that it doth not follow, that the Synod thought the Mixture neceſſary (taking the Words in your Senſe) becauſe they believ'd our Saviour made uſe of it himſelf; tho' it might be the main Reaſon, why they might think fit to enjoin it to thoſe who were under their Juriſdiction. But ſuppoſing they had thought it neceſſary; I ſee no reaſon why their Reſolution and Teſtimony ſhould be prefer'd to the Sentiments of the Church of *England*. 'Tis plain, they had no more convincing Proofs for it, than the Church of *England* has. And why ſhould not her Judgment be as much reſpected as theirs?

Beſides, Sir, it is ordered in the ſame Canon that the firſt Fruits of Honey and Milk be offer'd on the Altar upon one certain Day for the Myſtery of Infants. † This is a Cuſtom I am ſatisfied you won't approve of; and yet if this Synod has any Authority over us, I think it equally obliges to conſecrate Milk and Honey

---

* *Page* 34.

† Ἀπαρχὴ δὲ, εἴτε μέλι, εἴτε γάλα, ὡς εἴωθεν, προστρεφέσθω ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ εθίμῳ εἰς τὸ τῶν νηπίων μυστήριον. *Can.* 40. *in Reverend. Pandect. Vol.* 1. *Pag.* 565.

in the Room of the Euchariſt, * for the myſtical Uſe of Infants, as the mix'd Cup for the Uſe of the adult Faithful.

And as for the Council of *Trullo*, I think it no more binding to the Church of *England* than the Council of *Trent*. The *Latins* have rejected its Authority, and the Church of *England* has never own'd it. And I am apt to think, that ſome Perſons who are ſo fond of it upon this Occaſion, and call it Oecumenical will not think themſelves oblig'd by many of its Canons. The *Arminians* were more properly under the Juriſdiction of this Council, and therefore were Guilty of a very great Fault in diſobeying the Orders thereof. But then our Caſe is quite different, for theſe Fathers never had any Authority over *England:* And therefore this Council can no more oblige us to mix the Cup, than to forbear eating of Eggs, and Milk, on Saturdays and Lord's-Days in *Lent*, which the *Arminians* were oblig'd to obſerve under no leſs Penalty than Depoſition to the Clergy, and Suſpenſion to the Laity. †

That the Evidence of this Council (were it more to your purpoſe than it really is) ought not to be relied on may be prov'd from an egregious Miſtake, which is in the Canon || you cite againſt us. Here theſe Fathers ſay, that St. *James* the Brother of our Lord in his Divine Liturgy order'd that the Holy Cup ſhould be mix'd with Wine and Water: Whereas it is certain, that St. *James* did not compoſe this Liturgy that goes under his Name. For the Virgin *Mary* is called in it the *Mother of God*, and the Son and Holy Ghoſt ſaid to be *Conſubſtantial* with the Father, which are Terms that were never us'd for many Years after the Apoſtolical Age. It has likewiſe the Triſagion and Doxology, which were not generally made uſe of in the Church till the fifth Century. It contains Prayers for thoſe that were in Cloyſters, and who can believe that there were Monaſteries in St. *James*'s Time. There are likewiſe Incenſe, Churches and Altars, *&c.* mention'd in

* Vide Zonaram in hunc Canon.

† Vide *Can.* 56. *Apud Bevereg. Pandect.* || Can. 32.

whi

which no Man will ſay were us'd in the firſt Age. And as a farther Confirmation of the Forgery of this Miſſal, we find therein ſeveral Citations out of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, the greateſt part of which were written after St. *James*'s Death. This plain Miſtake ſufficiently weakens the Evidence of this Synod, and is a full Anſwer to the Author of the *Defence*, who thinks the Teſtimony of two hundred Biſhops is good Proof for Matter of Fact, and may be allow'd to paſs in a Chriſtian Court.

The Liturgies of St. *Baſil* and St. *Chryſoſtom* do not prove the Neceſſity of the mix'd Cup. As for St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Liturgy, which we have in *Goar*'s Euchologion, it will by no means ſerve your turn. For there the Deacon is to take warm Water, and deſire the Prieſt to bleſs it, and when the Prieſt has bleſt it, the Deacon pours it into the Holy Cup. * Now, Sir, here is warm Water, which you won't plead for, bleſt diſtinctly from the ſacred Cup, and the Mixture is made after the Cup is conſecrated, which is contrary to your Practice and Deſign.

If you look into *Goar*'s Euchologion page 148, it will let you into ſome Secrets which you will find unfavourable to your Deſign. Neither will the Miſſal under St. *Baſil*'s Name do you any Service. For all the mention of a Mixture is in theſe Words. *The Prieſt ſays*, And in like manner after our Saviour had taken the Cup of the Fruit of the Vine, when he had mix'd (or fill'd) it, given thanks, bleſſed and ſanctified it, he gave it to his Holy Diſciples. † Here the Word Κεράσας, which I have render'd mix'd, doth not ſignify that our Saviour mingled Water and Wine in the Cup, but only that he fill'd it; as I have elſewhere prov'd. And for a further Confirmation, I ſhall produce the 18*th* Chapter of the *Revelations*, Verſe 6. ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ᾧ ἐκέρασε, κεράσατε αὐτῇ διπλᾶ, which our Tranſlators have rendered

* Καὶ ποιεῖ σταυρὸν ἐν ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον· καὶ δεχόμενος τὸ ζέον, &c. *Goar's Ritual Græc. p.* 82.

† Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκ τῆς γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου λαβὼν κεράσας, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς. *Goar. p.* 168.

thus, *In the Cup which ſhe has fill'd, fill to her double.* Now this Cup refers to the third Verſe, where it is ſaid, *all nations have drank of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.* Beſides, Sir, your Author owns that our Saviour conſecrated the Cup, that had been already mix'd; and therefore if he ſuppoſes, that the Compiler of this Liturgy really meant that our Saviour mingled Water and Wine, he muſt own it as a Miſtake, and conſequently nothing to his purpoſe. If the Compiler thought ſo, it is plain he did not ſuppoſe himſelf oblig'd to follow our Saviour's Example. For he refers to St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Miſſal, which Orders warm Water to be pour'd into the Cup after the Conſecration of the whole Euchariſt is over.

This Cuſtom the *Greeks* made uſe of, to repreſent the warm Blood that flow'd from our Saviour, and the reaſon that they give, why the warm Water is not pour'd into the Holy Cup before, but after Conſecration, is becauſe it would grow cold by that time they could partake of it. *

Thus, Sir, I have anſwer'd your Letter, and prov'd that the Author of the two Books which you ſo earneſtly deſir'd me to read, has not brought one Father which pleads for the Neceſſity of the Mixture except St. *Cyprian*, who ſtands here by himſelf; and I have ſhewn that this warm Father, if rightly ſcan'd, doth not come up to near your Pitch. Nay *Aquinas* proves from this very Epiſtle you quote againſt us, that the Mixture of Water is not *de neceſſitate Sacramenti.* †

I could alſo produce ſeveral other Fathers of Note in the Church which mention the Cuſtom of mingling Wine and Water for the Sacrament, but I aſſure you none of them ſpeak of the Neceſſity of it. I ſuppoſe your learned Author did not care to cite them, for ſome other Reaſons than becauſe they would ſwell his Book too much. I have alſo ſhewn, that the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions won't do you any Service, and

---

* Vide Balſamon in 32 Can. Synod. Trull. Matt. Blaſtar. apud Bevereg. Pandect. Litera K. *Vol.* 2. *p.* 152.
Symeon. Theſſalonicenſ. de Templo, & Miſſâ Apud Goar. *p.* 229.

† P. 1s. 3. Quæſt. 74. Art. 3.

that

that had they been never ſo much againſt us, that they are Forgeries, and therefore of no Authority. I have likewiſe prov'd your two Councils too weak to ſupport your Cauſe, and yet theſe are the only Councils which are worth any regard at all, that ſpeak any thing of the matter. And laſtly, I have ſhewn that the Liturgies, which are called St. *Chryſoſtom*'s and St. *Baſil*'s, rather make againſt your Deſign; becauſe they order warm Water to be pour'd into the Cup after Conſecration.

I might take notice of ſome looſe Expreſſions of your Author, which are juſtly exceptionable; but as they are not likely to come upon the Stage again, but were only accidentally play'd againſt his Antagoniſt, and indeed are wide from this Controverſy, the profound Reſpect I have for his Perſon, *&c.* induces me to throw a Veil over them. I hope I ſhan't offend by ſaying, *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.* There is one thing I can't but take notice of, becauſe it ſeems to be the Foundation of his Miſtake; and that is, his Opinion that Water is Part of the Matter of the Sacramental Cup; in this Point I think he is ſingular. For I can't find one Father that backs his Opinion; the Schoolmen have determin'd againſt him, the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches do not in the leaſt favour him, and the poor deſpis'd Church of *England* is expreſly againſt him.

Has *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus* declar'd, that Water is properly Part of the Matter of the Euchariſtick Cup? No: They have ſaid nothing like it; nor can there be any thing wreſted from their Writings, which ſeems to give Colour to it. Has any of their Predeceſſors or Contemporaries favour'd this Notion? No: They have not ſo much as mention'd the Uſe of Water in the Sacrament, in any of their Writings which are extant. And as for St. *Cyprian*, who warmly pleads for it, becauſe he thought it contain'd ſome myſtical Significations, he is expreſs againſt the Author, and proves Wine to be the proper Matter of the Sacrament; *For when Chriſt ſays: I am the true Vine: The Blood*

of

of Chriſt certainly is not Water, but Wine. * *And again: He ſays,* Noe *tipifying a future Truth, did not drink Water but* Wine, *and ſo repreſented our Lord's Paſſion.* † And ſpeaking of *Melchiſideck* as another Type of Chriſt, He ſays: *For who is more a Prieſt of the moſt High God, than our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who offer'd a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offer'd the very ſame which* Melchiſideck *had offer'd, that is, Bread and* Wine, *to wit, his Body and Blood.* || And a little further he ſays, *The Water is an Emblem of the People; But the Blood of Chriſt is repreſented in the* Wine. * There are likewiſe ſeveral other Paſſages in this Father's Works which plainly declare that it is Wine alone, that repreſents the Blood of our Saviour, and conſequently nothing elſe can be the proper Matter of the Sacramental Cup.

Tertullian plainly declares, that it was Wine which was conſecrated in Remembrance of his Blood. † And *Optatus Milevitanus* that it was Wine that was offer'd in Sacrifice to God. || In ſhort, Sir, there is not one Father that ever I met with that gives any encouragement to your Author's Opinion; and I ſuppoſe, if he had met with any, he would have given us ſome better Proof than he has done, that this is not a new coin'd Opinion.

The various Reaſons that were given in different Churches and Times, for the Uſe of Water in the Eu-

---

* Nam cùm dicat Chriſtus: Ego ſum vitis vera; ſanguis Chriſti non aqua eſt utique, ſed Vinum. *Epiſt. ad Cecil. p.* 148.

† Noe Typum futuræ Veritatis oſtendens, non aquam, ſed vinum biberit, & ſic imaginem dominicæ paſſionis expreſſerit. *p.* 149.

|| Nam quis magis Sacerdos Dei ſummi, quàm Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus? qui ſacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchiſidech obtulerat, id eſt, panem & vinum, ſuum ſcilicet corpus, & ſanguinem. *Ibid.*

* Videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino verò oſtendi Sanguinem Chriſti. *p.* 153.

† Ne forte dicatur, ——— alium poſtea vini ſaporem, quod in ſanguinis ſui memoriam conſecravit. *Lib. de animâ, Sect.* 17.

|| Non & vinum à peccatoribus operariis & calcatur, & premitur, & ſic inde Deo ſacrificium offertur. *De Schiſ. Donatiſt. Lib.* 3. *Sect.* 4. *Edit. Du Pin.*

cha

chariſtick Cup, plainly proves that they did not think it eſſential to the Sacrament. Some us'd the Mixture, to repreſent the Water and Blood that flow'd from our Saviour's Side. Others, to ſhew the Union of Chriſt and his Church. Several us'd Water to ſignify the People; others, becauſe the Mixture was more pleaſant and agreeable to our Nature, and therefore fitter to repreſent this Spiritual Drink; and not to be too tedious, I ſhall only mention one Reaſon more which prevail'd a long Time, and that was, to ſignify the Union of the two Natures of Chriſt. And here I ſhall obſerve, that the only Reaſon why the *Arminians* rejected the common Uſage of the Church, and made uſe of mere Wine, and unleavened Bread, was becauſe they would ſignify thereby that there was but one Nature in Chriſt. To this they were puſh'd on by the Jacobites, a very early and dangerous Sect of Hereticks that infeſted the Church for many Hundred Years. But as ſoon as they were perſwaded to leave this Party, and to condemn *Eutyches* and ſome other monſtrous Hereticks in the Council of *Tarſis*, in order to unite with the *Greek* Church, they preſently comply'd with the Mixture.* In like manner ſeveral Churches gave ſuch like Reaſons, why they us'd leaven'd or unleaven'd Bread. Sometimes they us'd a Loaf to ſignify their Unity; At another time Wafers; and yet the myſtery did not ceaſe, for hereby they repreſented the Money which was the Price of our Lord's Body. In ſhort, they had many myſtical Meanings in all their Ceremonies about the Sacrament, which varied in different Places and Times. And this plainly ſhews, that this Cuſtom of mixing the Cup was not thought eſſential to the Being of the Sacrament, but was only us'd emblematically, according as the Humour of the Age lead them.

It is probable the Church of *England* might leave off this Cuſtom, becauſe ſhe did not like the Reaſons which ſeem'd chiefly to ſupport it. However ſhe is not oblig'd by them, and 'tis certain ſhe doth not intend by uſing pure Wine to encourage, by way of Myſtery,

* Niceph. Calixt. *Lib.* 18. *Cap.* 53.

any

any Opinion whatſoever. And therefore by Virtue o
her ἀυτοκεφάλια, the thing being indifferent in its own
Nature, ſhe may uſe her Liberty.

But to proceed. The Determination of the School-
men upon this Point, is very ſtrong againſt your Au-
thor. For they all agree, that the proper Matter o
the Sacramental Cup is Wine, *Vinum de vite*, and tha
the Water is but an Adjunct, and Circumſtantial to th
Euchariſt. And therefore conclude, *aquam in Sacra-
mento Euchariſtiæ, non ex neceſſitate calici commiſceri, ſe
ex congruitate Sacramenti, vel obligatione Præcepti.* I wav
their Reaſons, becauſe I ſuppoſe your Author won
think himſelf oblig'd by them; and the only Motive
which induc'd me to produce their Opinion, is to prov
your Author oppoſes the whole *Latin* Church, whic
has eſpouſed the School Deciſion upon this Point. An
as for the *Greek* Church, 'tis plain, by their puttin
warm Water into the Cup after Conſecration, tha
they do not believe it *de neceſſitate Sacramenti:* An
laſtly, the Church of *England* has fully declar'd her O
pinion about the *Matter* of the Sacrament in her ex
cellent Catechiſm, where ſhe ſays, that the outwar
Part or *Sign* of the Lord's Supper, is Bread and *Wi*
So that I think, I have plainly prov'd that your Au
thor is ſingular in his Opinion, and therefore it oug
not to have any Influence on us.

The next thing you demand to be reſtor'd, is, *Praye
for the Dead.* For my own part, I dare not ſay th
all Remembrances of the Dead are unlawful in o
Devotions. Neither am I under any Temptation
it, as a faithful Member of the Church of *Engla*
For ſhe has no where condemned them, nor need I
afraid to ſay, that it is probable, when they are n
tinctur'd with Superſtition, they may be uſeful. F
the beſt Defenders of our Church, have in their pu
lick Writings own'd it. Archbiſhop *Uſher*, Biſhop *T
lor*, Biſhop *Mountague*, Biſhop *Forbs*, &c. have w
upon it, and the learned Mr. *Thorndike* ſays, *It has b
a Cuſtom ſo general in the Church to pray for
Dead that no beginning of it can be aſſign'd, no ti*

no part of the Church where it was not us'd. * And tho' this is ſomething more than he has or could prove, yet it ſhews what were the general Sentiments of our beſt Authors upon this Subject, and is a good Proof that my Conceſſions are not inconſiſtent with the Principles of our Church. I might likewiſe add, that the *Presbyterians* in *Germany* uſe this Form at their Funerals, *God grant him an undiſturbed Reſt, and a Reſurrection to a bleſſed Life.* †

But the Queſtion is not, whether Prayers for the Dead, as they were us'd by many of the Primitive Chriſtians, be lawful or uſeful; but whether it is abſolutely neceſſary, to reſtore either the Form in King *Edward*'s Liturgy, or add ſome new Compoſition to our Common-Prayer Book, which may have ſome Reſemblance to it. You ſeem your ſelf to be a little cautious about the Matter, upon the Point of Expediency, and therefore ſay you will be contented, if we leave out theſe Words, Militant here in Earth. in the Prayer for the whole State of Chriſt's Church.

The wiſe Man || ſays, there is a Time and Seaſon for all Things, and if ever ſuch an Attempt was unſeaſonable, certainly it is now, when the Church of *England* is ſo powerfully attack'd from ſeveral Quarters. 'Tis now when the Vitals of Religion are puſh'd at, and the common Cauſe of Chriſtianity lies at Stake. Shall our Charity for the Dead ſwallow up all our Concern for the Living? And to be plain with you, I can't but think it a very improper time to attempt the ſtriking out three or four Words from the Common-Prayer; when there are ſo many Factions endeavouring to take away the whole. It is an ill time to give any Diſturbance to the Church of *England*, when we hear from ſeveral Quarters that dreadful Alarm, *Down with it, down with it to the Ground.*

---

* Epilog. *Lib.* 3. *p.* 333.

† Deus det ei pacatam quietem, & beatam ad vitam reſurrectionem. Binchii Melleſic. Thealogic. *Pars* 5. *Artic.* 3. *de mortuorum ſepulturâ.*

|| *Eccleſ.* 3. 1.

Perhaps you may tell me; this is but unſeaſonable Cant. For you hold it neceſſary to pray for the Dead at the Euchariſt Service. And indeed you can have no other Plea to excuſe your Raſhneſs, as well as your Separation from the Church of *England*. I ſhall therefore examine whether your Author has prov'd this Point.

The firſt he brings for it is *Tertullian*, who ſays, *Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annuo die facimus. Tertullian* doth not ſay, they ſaid Maſs every Year for the deceaſed Souls, nor, in your Authors Words, *that they mentioned the Names of the Deceaſed on the Anniverſary of their Death, in the Prayers of the Euchariſtick Sacrifice.* † No, The Words in plain *Engliſh* run thus. *We make Offerings for the deceaſed upon (or for) the Anniverſary of their Death.* Now I don't ſee any Reaſon, why we ſhould think theſe Offerings were the Euchariſt, or Prayers made for the deceas'd at the Time of the Euchariſtick Sacrifice. But I rather think, they were Gifts or Legacies which were given to the Church or Poor; and it may be, the very ſame as they us'd to give when they were alive upon the Anniverſary of their Birth. It was in former times, and indeed is now the Cuſtom for Men of Fortune, to celebrate their Birth-day, and give liberally to the Poor;* and it is not unuſual to leave Legacies for the uſe of the Needy upon the Anniverſary of their Death. Theſe Loaves, *&c.* which the Church-Wardens of moſt Pariſhes diſtribute upon this Account, I believe are ſomething like the Offerings which *Tertullian* means.

But ſuppoſing *Tertullian* did really mean, that Maſs was ſaid Annually for the deceaſed, yet I am ſatisfied, this is not what your Author pleads for, and did he plead for it, yet it doth not appear neceſſary any more than the Trine Immerſion in Baptiſm; their taking of Honey and Milk after it, and ſeveral other uſeleſs Cuſtoms, which ſtand upon the ſame Foot.

I own, that *Tertullian* ſuppoſes, that a Husband

---

* De Coronâ Militis. *Cap.* 3.
* Dat Natalitia in Hortis. *Cicero.*

† *Reaſons* p. 11.

ſhould

ſhould pray for the Soul of his dead Wife, * and the Wife for her Husband; † but yet theſe Paſſages which were written when he had drank the very Dregs of *Montaniſm*, relate only to their private Prayers for them; and this is what you may do without giving any Offence to the Church of *England*. And for my own Part, I won't quarrel with you, ſo long as you don't diſturb the Church, if the Matter of your Prayers be the ſame as *Tertullian* directs. *In primâ reſurrectione conſortium.* ‖ That your chief Favourites may accompany thoſe that riſe firſt, for the enjoyment of the *Millenium*. He thought it a mighty Diſadvantage to riſe laſt, and that the paying the uttermoſt farthing, in *Matthew* 5. 26. was the delay of the Reſurrection. * And quotes the Paraclete for it.

The next which is produc'd to prove the Neceſſity of Prayers for the Dead is St. *Cyprian*, who ſays, that the Biſhops conſidering that the Buſineſs of a Clergyman was to ſerve at the Altar, and to be employ'd in Spiritual and not in worldly Affairs, had provided againſt any one's naming a Clergyman, Executor, or Truſtee. *And if any did this, there ſhould be no Offerings made for him, nor Sacrifice celebrated upon the Account of his Death. For he doth not deſerve to be nominated in the Prayers of the Prieſts at the Altar of God, who wilfully calls of the Prieſts and Miniſters from the Service of the Altar. And therefore ſince* Victor *contrary to the Decree lately made by the Synod, has preſum'd to appoint* Geminius Fauſtinus, *who is a Prieſt, to a Guardianſhip.* You ought not to make any Offerings, upon the Account of his Death or uſe any Prayers in the Church upon his Account. †

---

* Exhort. ad Caſtitatem. *Cap.* 11.

† Liber de Monagamiâ. *Cap.* 10.

‖ Ibid. * Lib. de anima. Cap. 58.

† Ac ſi quis hoc feciſſet, non offerretur pro eo, nec ſacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. Neq; enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in ſacerdotum prece, qui ab altari ſacerdotes & Miniſtros voluit avocare. Et ideo Victor, cùm contra formam nuper in Concilio à ſacerdotibus datam, Geminium Fauſtinum Preſbyterum auſus ſit tutorem conſtituere, non eſt quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in Eccleſia frequentetur. *Epiſt.* 1.

To avoid prolixity, I ſhall paſs by the ſpecious Gloſſes of *Chemnitius*, and ſome other learned Men. For my deſign is only to prove that what you demand is not neceſſary. Well then, ſuppoſing St. *Cyprian* really meant, that the Soul of *Victor* ſhould not be prayed for at the Holy Altar, yet this doth not prove that he thought it abſolutely neceſſary always to pray for the Dead at the Euchariſtick Sacrifice. For granting it the Cuſtom of that Time, yet without it can be prov'd St. *Cyprian* thought, that all the Cuſtoms that were us'd in the *African* Church, were indiſpenſably neceſſary to all other Churches afterwards, his Practice won't come up to your purpoſe.

It was the Cuſtom of this Age to inſcribe the Names of all the Faithful in the Diptychs * of the Church, which were all recited at the Altar. † This was not thought convenient in the fourth Century, and then the Names of very eminent Men were only regiſter'd and recited. And in a few Ages after, even this Uſage was neglected in moſt Parts of the World: For they only regiſter'd and recited the Names of the Patriarchs.

But ſuppoſing St. *Cyprian* did really think it neceſſary to pray for the Dead at the Euchariſtick Sacrifice, yet it doth not prove it to be ſo, nor has he given us any Reaſon why we ſhould think ſo: Suppoſe St. *Cyprian* thought it neceſſary to give the Euchariſt to Children, which was the Cuſtom in his Age, and warmly pleaded for by St. *Auſtin* after him. Yet this doth not prove that the thing was neceſſary. And it is plain, the *Weſtern* Churches for many Ages have been of another Opinion.

Your Author ſays, he doth not except againſt this Practice. But doth he inſiſt on the Neceſſity of it? If he thinks Prayers for the Dead are not more neceſſary, I have done with the Argument, and ſhall only ask why the Church is diſturb'd about the one, any more than the other.

---

* *The* Diptychs *were Two Tables, one of which contain'd the Names of the living Faithful, and the other the dead.*

† Vide Dodwell Diſſert. Cyprian. Diſſert. 5.

After

After all; if I may be allow'd to give my Opinion about the Caſe, which is mention'd by St. *Cyprian*, I think it is this. *Victor* was under a ſort of Excommunication for contemning the Decrees of the Synod, and therefore St. *Cyprian* did not think fit, that he ſhould have the Honour of having his Name inſcrib'd in the *Diptychs*, nor recited at the Altar. This was done to fix a diſgrace upon his Memory, and to deter others from the like Practice. And as the Church had diſown'd him, it was very improper that the Funeral Prayers ſhould be ſaid upon his Account. The firſt Part of the Sentence relates to a Cuſtom which ſeems to take its riſe not long before St. *Cyprian*'s Time, and ſoon expir'd, when the Church ceas'd to be Perſecuted: For the Intention of the Church in uſing theſe Ceremonies was to encourage Martyrdom, and a bold Confeſſion of the Faith. And the other part of the Sentence is much like that of the Church of *England*, that the funeral Prayers ſhall not be ſaid for excommunicated Perſons, *&c.*

The next Authority which your Author produces, to prove the Neceſſity of Prayers for the Dead, is the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. Had theſe Conſtitutions been really Apoſtolical, he needed not to urge this Practice upon the Church of *England*. But, Sir, 'tis plain, as I have already prov'd, that they are ſpurious, and therefore he might as well have quoted the preſent Maſs-Book: For I am perſwaded he will as ſoon get any of the Church of *England* to own the Authority of the one, as the other. Nay, I believe, your Author himſelf is ſo far from thinking many of the Directions in theſe Conſtitutions Neceſſary, that there are ſeveral things in them that he doth not think Lawful. For my own part I have no exception againſt the Form which he cites from this forg'd Book; had the Church of *England* thought fit to have made Uſe of it. But all that I urge, is, that the Authority of theſe Conſtitutions is not ſufficient to prove the thing to be Neceſſary.

The next Reaſon why Prayers for the Dead muſt of Neceſſity be reſtor'd, is, becauſe *St.* James *Biſhop of* Niſibis, *who made part of the Council of* Nice, *and was famous for working Miracles pray'd for a dead Perſon, that God would pardon his Sins, and admit him into the*

the Company of the Juſt. You may if you pleaſe uſe the ſame Words in your Cloſet. For I don't find that he read this Prayer from any Liturgy. And for my own part, I won't fall out with you, if you follow this Biſhop's Example, who *Theodoret* tells us pray'd for ſome dead Men to be reſtor'd to Life, and it came to paſs. * But I hope you won't think it neceſſary to have a Form in our Liturgy for this Purpoſe.

I ſee no Reaſon to be of your Author's Opinion, that the Holy Life, and Orthodox Faith of this Biſhop is a good Evidence for your Practice. For there have been as Holy, and Orthodox Biſhops on the other Side of the Queſtion. And as for his Miracles, which *Theodoret* relates done by him, believe them who will, They have juſt the ſame Influence on me as the extravagant Legends of the Papiſts. *Valeſius* † gives inconteſtable Proof againſt the Credit of *Theodoret*, in Relation to ſome Miracles done by *Niſibenſis*. And if we ſtrip this Biſhop of his Miracles, he will appear no more than an Orthordox, Holy Man; and ſuch, I hope were many of the *Engliſh* Biſhops, who were of a different Opinion from you in this Point.

Your Author goes on, and tells us of ſeveral Holy Biſhops, that pray'd for the Dead, St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, and St. *Auſtin*. If your Author can prove it neceſſary to reſtore all the Uſages of theſe holy Men, I own he has gain'd his Point. But till this is done, I ſhall beg leave to ſay he has been a little too unwary in what he has ſaid in relation to them. Suppoſe St. *Cyril* was for the Invocation of Saints, will your Author think it is neceſſary for us to do ſo? The very Book that is cited, contains many Points which he himſelf won't allow to be Orthodox and Lawful. ||

The Prayer, which is cited from St. *Ambroſe*, was for one that died unbaptiz'd. * Now I am apt to think

---

* Lib. 1. Cap. 7. † Annot. in *Lib.* 2. Theodor. *cap.* 3

|| *Vid.* Catech. Myſtagog.

Sed audio vos dolere, quod non acceperit Sacramenta Baptiſmatis. *Ambroſ. in Obit. Valentiniani.*

th

that your Author is ſo far from thinking this Act of St. *Ambroſe* neceſſary, that he will not allow it to be lawful. If I am miſtaken, all that I ſhall ſay, is, that St. *Ambroſe* and your Author are the only Men of Value, that ever I could find, who thought ſo.

Epiphanius has ſaid many Things which won't bear ſcanning. He puts ſome Things into the Liſt of Hereſies, which have no Relation at all to the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity. And if his Book is to be the Standard of Hereſy, your worthy Author will find it a difficult Matter to come off Scotfree. After all, it doth not appear that *Epiphanius* thought the rejecting Prayers for the dead was an Hereſy: But he reckon'd *Aërius* an Heretick for *leaving the Church*, upon pretence that Prayers for the dead were unlawful. The Reaſon of his ſevere Charge is as much againſt you who *leave the Church of* England, upon pretence that Prayers for the dead are abſolutely neceſſary. It was uſual for *Epiphanius* to rank Schiſmaticks among Hereticks, ſo that had *Aërius* been ſound and orthodox in other Points, and peaceable in the Church, he might in all Probability have held Prayers for the dead not to be neceſſary, and yet have never been cenſur'd for an Heretick. My Reaſon is this, Becauſe St. *Auſtin* doth not call his rejecting Prayers for the dead, and the Obſervations of the ſtated Faſts of the Church, any more than his private Opinions. *

St. *Chryſoſtom* thought it lawful to pray for the Souls of wicked Men, and that our Prayers and Almſgivings would be very ſerviceable to them. † This is ſomewhat more than your Author thinks convenient, and if I miſtake him not, he ſcarce thinks this Practice lawful.

Laſtly, St. *Auſtin* thought it unlawful to pray for a Martyr; ‖ for he reckon'd this was doing them an In-

---

* Fertur —— propria quoque dogmata addiſſe nonnulla, dicens orare, vel offerre pro mortuis oblationem non oportere nec ſtatuta ſolenniter celebranda eſſe Jejunia. *Lib.* ad Quodvult deum. *Sect.* 53.

† Ad populum Antioch. *Homil.* 69.
Item. Serm. de *Job*, & *Abrah. m.*

‖ Expoſit. in Evang. *Johan. Caſ.* 5. *Tract.* 84.

jury. *

jury. * Whereas St. *Cyprian* thought fit to offer more particularly for Martyrs. † And the oldeſt Liturgies that are now extant, contain Prayers not only for Martyrs, but for the Apoſtles, and even for the bleſſed Virgin. I might likewiſe add, that St. *Auſtin* had ſome Opinions concerning the State of the Dead, that are widely different from your learned Author's Sentiments, and directly contradictory to moſt of the Fathers which he has cited.

And now, Sir, I think it doth not appear neceſſary to follow all the Opinions of theſe holy Men: Tho' I own them as very great Lights and Ornaments of the Chriſtian Religion. Nor can I ſee any Reaſon for your Author's ſuſpecting that we ſhould have quitted their Communion, had we liv'd in their Age; becauſe we don't think it neceſſary nor convenient to follow all their Uſages: For all lawful Cuſtoms are not always neceſſary or expedient.

We have but few, if any, of the genuine Liturgies that were us'd in the fourth Age; and therefore I can't help thinking your Author a little too raſh in his Cenſures upon his Brethren. For 'tis poſſible the Liturgies of that Time might be much more tender upon this Point than he ſuppoſes. However, Sir, granting the contrary, yet it is no Argument againſt us. When the Queſtion is not, whether they are barely lawful, but whether they are abſolutely neceſſary. And our Difference doth not conſiſt about what we ought to do then, but what we are oblig'd to do now. For the Conſequence is not neceſſary, that becauſe I would not ſeperate from their Communion, therefore I ought to quit the Church of *England*. What might be my Duty then, becauſe lawfully commanded, would be a great Sin now, becauſe it would be an Act of Diſobedience againſt an Authority equally lawful and competent. In ſhort, Sir, I think we are no more oblig'd by their Cuſtoms, than an *Engliſhman*, while in his own

* De verbis Apoſtoli. *Serm.* 17.

† Sacrificia pro eis ſemper, ut meminiſtis offerimus, *Cyp. Epiſt.* 39.

Country, is bound by the particular Laws of any Foreign State. And as he would be juſtly deem'd a factious Rebel, that would introduce any ancient Cuſtoms, tho' lawful in their own Nature, againſt the Order of the State; ſo I can't ſee but he is a Schiſmatick, that will unduly bring in ancient Cuſtoms, however lawful in themſelves, againſt the direct Authority of that Church of which he is a Member.

Another Reaſon why it is neceſſary to alter our Common-Prayer-Book, is, becauſe in the *Greek* Liturgies, the *Gallican*, and *Moſarabick* Miſſals, and the *Ordo Romanus*, there are Prayers for the Dead. If this Argument will hold then I think it is as ſtrong for reſtoring ſome other Prayers which I find in them, that your Author doth not plead for. For if the Authority of theſe Liturgies, is ſufficient to warrant one Practice, againſt the Order and Directions of the Church of *England*, why not all the Practices which every one of them agree in? I will not puſh the Conſequences of this Argument, becauſe I believe your Author did not deſign them. But pardon me for ſaying, it gives too great an Handle to the Enemies of our Church.

How your Author will diſtinguiſh what he calls modern *Purgatory*, from St. *Auſtin*'s Purgatory, I can't tell. Nor do I ſee any great Difference between his own Notion of the Thing, and the Definition of the Council of *Trent*. The Council teaches, that the Souls which are detain'd in Purgatory, are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful, and more eſpecially by the acceptable Sacrifices of the Altar, and that theſe Prayers, *&c.* are only to be offer'd for the Faithful, * and ſuch as die in Chriſt. † Your Author ſuppoſes, that when a Man is pious and regular in the main, ſome Faults may be paſs'd over by the Interceſſion of the Church, and ſome leſſer Failing not accounted for upon that Score. ‖ And to keep Peace with the Council, he ſays, *That*

* Council Trident. Seſſ. 25. De Purgator.
† Seſſ. 22. Cap. 2.
‖ Defence, Pag. 91.

the Fathers ſuppoſe this commemorative Sacrifice, the moſt efficacious Means to propitiate God the Father, and procure the Bleſſings pray'd for. * Now this ſeems to me as like Purgatory, as one Apple is like another. And it is my Opinion, that *Bellarmine* himſelf would not have found fault with the Deſcription.

And now to ſum up your Author's Argument. *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian* pray'd for the Dead, and in the middle and latter end of the Fourth Century, there were ſome eminent Fathers who encourag'd this Practice. And we have ſeveral old Miſſals, in which we meet with Prayers for the Dead. And therefore it is neceſſary (tho' it be againſt all Rule and Order) to alter our Common-Prayer-Book, and make it ſpeak more to the purpoſe. As for *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*, I think I have clear'd them from being ſuch formidable Enemies (as your Author repreſents them) to the Church of *England*. And as for the few Fathers of the Fourth Century, which he cites, I have prov'd them inconſiſtent with one another, and contradictory to the common Senſe of the Church, and 'tis improbable their particular Noſtrums ſhould get into the publick Liturgies, however they might affect their private Prayers. And as for the *Greek* Miſſals, *&c.* they no more oblige us to pray for the Dead, than to uſe ſome other Prayers, which I believe your Author won't plead for. And to this I might add, ſome of theſe Forms have not all the Subſtance his Notion of the Thing ſeems to require, and therefore could he perſwade his Brethren to receive the leaſt offenſive of them, yet they won't give him full Content.

And now I ſhall take leave to offer ſome Reaſons why we ſhould not be over-haſty to alter the preſent Liturgy, and introduce ſuch Prayers as your Author ſeems to plead for.

Firſt, Becauſe the Scripture no where commands the Uſe of ſuch Prayers as your Author pleads for. None of the Canonical Writings mention Sacrifices, among the *Jews* for the Dead, nor any expiatory Prayers, and

* Defence, Page 93.

Offerings among Chriſtians for the departed Souls of their Brethren. *Moſes* was very punctual in giving cloſe Directions in Matters of leſs moment than this; and why ſhould we think, he would conceal a Duty ſo highly pleaſing to God, and ſo very ſerviceable to the Souls of his Friends. In the *New Teſtament* we have full and frequent Directions about our Prayers for the Living: Nay, againſt the common Uſage of the World, we are order'd to pray for our Enemies, and thoſe that deſpitefully uſe us. * And why ſhould we think that our Saviour and his Apoſtles would not have put us in mind of praying for our departed Friends, if they were ſo very ſerviceable to the Relief of their Souls.

Secondly, The Fathers of the Two firſt Centuries are ſilent about the matter. † Had there been any unwritten Tradition for this Practice, 'tis very likely we ſhould have had ſome Footſteps of it in ſome of their Writings. Several of them ſpeak of the *Euchariſt*, Prayers for ſeveral Occaſions, the *Reſurrection*, and the *Laſt Judgment*, but ſay not one Word of offering for the Dead, tho' moſt of theſe Subjects naturally lead to it. *Juſtin Martyr* ‖ gives the Emperor a full Account of all the Cuſtoms of the Chriſtians of his Time. And when he comes to ſpeak of the *Euchariſt*, he informs him not only of the Matter of this Sacrament, but alſo of the Manner of their celebrating it, and of every particular Ceremony they made uſe of at it, without ſo much as leaving out even the *Oſculum Sanctum*. He tells him how they eſteem'd it after Conſecration, and gives him the Reaſon of the Inſtitution. In ſhort, after he has given him a full Relation of every Practice about it, he informs him of their charitable Collections at this Time, for the Fatherleſs and Widow, the Sick and Needy, * but doth not ſpeak one Word of their charitable Oblations for the Relief of the Dead. Now

---

* Matt. 5. 44.

† Note *Tertullian*'s Books, *De Coronâ Militis, De Caſtitate, & de Monogamiâ*, were written in the Third Century.

‖ He flouriſh'd, *Anno* 150.

* *Juſtin Martyr Apol* 2. *pro Chriſtianis.*

had this been a Practice in his Time, at leaſt had it been thought a neceſſary Cuſtom, 'tis probable that this Holy Martyr, who did not conceal the minuteſt Uſage of the Chriſtians, would have given the Emperor ſome Account of it. 'Tis a little ſtrange, that a Practice ſo eſſential to the Being of a Church, as your Author inſinuates, ſhould not be diſcover'd by any Writings that are not above Two Hundred Years old. For tho' theſe Two Ages were not crowded with ſo many Voluminous Authors, as the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, yet there are enough of their Works remaining, to give us Reaſon to believe, that this was not a general Uſage.

Your Author will be put to it to ſhew, what Parts of the Chriſtian Worſhip, and what neceſſary Cuſtoms there are now, which they have not mention'd. And I believe he is the only Man that is ſo well vers'd in their Writings, who would give this for a Reaſon why they forgot to mention Prayers for the Dead. *Becauſe their main Deſign was to put an end to Schiſm, to combate Hereſy, to preſs Obedience to the Governors of the Church, and defend their own Religion.* * And therefore they were not at Leiſure, it ſeems, to give us an Account of the neceſſary Rights, Ceremonies, and Worſhip that belong'd to the Chriſtian Church. For what could more naturally lead them to the mention of their Rights, Ceremonies, and Worſhip, than their Apologies, which they induſtriouſly made in Defence of them againſt the Heathens. What more forcible Arguments could theſe Chriſtians uſe, to keep up Obedience to the Governors of the Church, than to tell the contumacious they ſhould not have the Benefit of her Prayers when they died, had they thought it was ſuch a great Service to their Souls to pray for them. Your Author owns, in St. *Cyprian's* Time this was thought a good Motive to preſs Obedience, and one of their ſtrongeſt Guards againſt Contumacy. † And again, do we find nothing inſtructive in their Writings

---

* Defence, Pag. 70. † Cyp. Epiſt. 1.

againſt

againſt Hereſies and Schiſms; 'tis my Opinion we have a very conſiderable Light into all the neceſſary Part of our Worſhip through them. And that the only Reaſon why we don't find any mention of Prayers for the Dead in their Works, is not, becauſe they were ſtifled by their Controverſies, but becauſe they were ignorant of the Notion, or at leaſtwiſe, it was not a general Practice. For tho' the *Sibylline* Oracles, which were forg'd in the middle of the Second Century, mention Prayers for the Dead, yet it is no Argument, with Submiſſion to your worthy Author, that this was cuſtomary at that Time among the Chriſtians: For they were deſign'd to paſs for the Genuine Writings of ſome Heathen Propheteſſes, that liv'd long before the Birth of Chriſtianity. And who can think the Catholicks of that Time would take up a Pagan Cuſtom upon the Credit of theſe Heathens.

I might likewiſe ſhew what innumerable Corruptions have ſprung from this Cuſtom in the *Romiſh* Church. The Inſtances are enough to make a Book by themſelves: And therefore, ſuppoſing ſuch Prayers as your Author ſeems to plead for, to be lawful, yet ſince we have no poſitive Command for them in Scripture, and the two Firſt Centuries furniſh us with no Matter for the Preſumption of an unwritten Tradition for them, I ſee no Reaſon why we ſhould blame the Conduct of the Church of *England*, in taking away the Occaſion of theſe Abuſes. When the Brazen Serpent, which was ſo very ſerviceable to the *Iſraelites*, became the Occaſion of Sin and Folly, good King *Hezekiah* call'd it *Nehuſhtam*, and brake it to Pieces. * And the Feaſts of Charity, which were of Apoſtolical Appointment, were ſoon put down in moſt Churches, on the Account of ſome Irregularities that were done at them.

I might likewiſe take notice of the Scandal this ſudden Attempt gives to many weak, tho' pious Chriſtians, whoſe Prejudices againſt this Doctrine are ſo ſtrongly rooted by their Education, that ſhould the

* 2 Kings. 18. 46.

whole

whole Body of the Convocation, and all the Non-juring Clergy declare Prayers for the Dead to be uſeful, yet it would be impoſſible preſently to perſwade them, that they are barely lawful. And therefore I think St. *Paul*'s Rule may be very properly applied upon this Occaſion. †

But to keep within Bounds; I ſhall wave many more Reaſons, which might be urg'd againſt an haſty Alteration of our Liturgy, and ſhall briefly prove that the Church of *England* is not unmindful of the Dead. For tho' ſhe has guarded againſt the Corruptions which ſhelter'd themſelves under the Practice you plead for; yet there is Matter enough ſtill remaining in her Liturgy, for a willing Mind to keep up the full notion of Communion with departed Saints; and therefore we need not be ſo uneaſy; ſuppoſing that an Article of our Creed (as your Author ſuggeſts) is concern'd in this Caſe?

The firſt Inſtance I ſhall produce, is, that Prayer in our Litany. *Remember not, Lord, our Offences, nor the Offences of our Fore-fathers.* I know there are many who don't intend by this Prayer to remember the Dead, but only deſire that the Sins of their Anceſtors may not be viſited upon them. But ſince the Expreſſion will bear another Signification, and I mean by this Petition to remember the Dead; why mayn't I be ſuppos'd to pray as effectually in theſe Terms, as in the Words of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, eſpecially ſince the Church has no where declar'd againſt Prayers for the Dead, nor explain'd her meaning in this Prayer againſt my Intention.

There is another Prayer in our Litany which ſeems to bear ſome relation to the Dead, and that is, the Petition for deliverance *in the hour of death and in the day of judgment.* I believe it will be granted on all Sides, that here we pray againſt ſome Evils that may befal us, when the Soul is ſeparated from the Body; and that we may have a merciful Trial, at the laſt, and ge-

† Rom. 14. 13, 14, &c.

neral

neral Aſſize ; when the Dead ſhall be ſummon'd to give an account of all the Actions they have done in the Body. As therefore what we here pray for doth only affect the Dead, I ſhall crave leave, *for the preſent*, to call this a Prayer for the Dead : Becauſe the only ſcriptural Proof your Author brings for this Practice, is that Prayer of St. *Paul* for *Oneſephorus*, *The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day.* * And I believe he will not be able to ſhew any difference between the Senſe of St. *Paul*'s Words, and the Expreſſions in our Liturgy.

There is another Inſtance, in the Prayer for *Chriſt's Church.* There we don't only praiſe God for all his Servants departed this Life in his Faith and Fear, but we ſignify our deſire that they as well as our ſelves may be partakers of his heavenly Kingdom. Your Author indeed, thinks the Words *here militant in Earth* were inſerted on purpoſe to exclude the Dead. That they don't entirely ſhut out the Dead, muſt be own'd on all Sides ; becauſe we do here, in very ſtrong Terms, praiſe God for all thoſe who have died in his Faith and Fear. I readily grant that the Church by this Addition did intend to keep out that ſcandalous Practices of *Maſſes* for the Dead, and that ſhe has hereby effectually taken away all pretence of proſtituting the Sacrament, and carrying on this abominable Abuſe of it. But, Sir, it is no Argument, that becauſe ſhe won't offer Sacrifices for the Dead, that therefore ſhe don't remember them in her Prayers. For tho' we don't offer the Sacrament for Infidels and Hereticks, yet no body can deny, but we pray for them.

Sacrifices, and Prayers for the Dead, are two things, and if you pleaſe to make the Diſtinction, you will eaſily ſee your Author's Miſtake, when he ſays, *there is a plain Inconſiſtency in our Common-Prayer-Book*, and conſequently that there is no Neceſſity to throw out theſe Words, *Militant here in Earth*, to make the Church of *England* agree with her ſelf.

---

* 2 Timothy 1. 18.

Another

Another Inſtance which I ſhall offer, is, that Prayer in the Communion Service; that we, and *all the whole Church*, may obtain Remiſſion of our Sins and all other Benefits of Chriſt's Paſſion. *All the whole Church*, I think, includes the whole Number of the Faithful, not only the Living but the Dead. The Expreſſion reaches all the Children of God; and takes in the full Notion of the *Catholick Church and Communion of Saints*. So that we have no Occaſion to alter our Common-Prayer-Book, under the pretence of reſtoring an Article of our Creed.

And laſtly, I refer you to the Burial Office, which is ſaid over the dead Perſon at the Grave, and there I ſhall leave this Subject.

The next thing which is thought neceſſary to be reſtor'd, is the Prayer for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Sacramental Elements. The Words in the firſt reformed Liturgy ſtand thus, in the Conſecration Prayer. *Hear us (O merciful Father) we beſeech thee, and with thy holy Spirit, and word vouchſafe to bleſs and ſanctify theſe thy Gifts and Creatures, of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy moſt dearly beloved Son Jeſus Chriſt.*

For my own part, I own it a Good Prayer, and was it in our Liturgy I ſhould think it my Duty to make uſe of it. But the Queſtion is not, whether the Prayer be Good, but whether it be eſſentially Neceſſary. For if it be not Neceſſary, your Separation has no tolerable pretence. Now to make it ſo; you muſt either prove a poſitive Command for it; or ſhew an early and plain Tradition for it; or demonſtrate that this Form, or ſome Prayer like it is neceſſary in the Nature of the thing.

Has your Author produc'd a poſitive Command for it. No; he tells us indeed that our Saviour bleſs'd the Bread and the Cup. Ἐυλογήσας καὶ ἐυχαριςήσας. And this he thinks is in other Words praying for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt. If this will hold; then every time we ſay Grace, we are to pray for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon our Victuals, and our Saviour, when

h

he bleſs'd the Loaves and Fiſhes, * pray'd for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon them. Λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε —— ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα καὶ εὐλογήσας. † And after all, whoever reads our Communion Service, will think that your Author doth not do fairly by the Church, when he ſuggeſts that ſhe doth not pray for a Bleſſing upon the Sacrament.

But *Secondly*, Have we any plain and early Tradition for ſuch a Form as your Author demands. No, Indeed he produces ſome like Prayers out of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, and tells us, that the Prayer for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt is preſerv'd in the Liturgies of St. *James*, St. *Mark* and St. *Peter*. But has your Author prov'd theſe *Miſſals* are not ſpurious. For before we depend upon their Authority, we muſt deſire much better Proof than has hitherto been brought, that they are Genuine. 'Tis probable all thoſe Liturgies were forg'd in the Fourth Century. However, It is certain that ſeveral Prayers that are in them can claim no higher *Æra*; and 'tis poſſible this may be as lately inſerted as any.

But again, Has any Father inform'd us of a Tradition for the Neceſſity of ſuch a Form. The only one cited for this Purpoſe, is St. *Baſil*, whoſe Words are theſe. *What Saint has left us in Writing the Words of Invocation, when we conſecrate the Bread of the Euchariſt, and the Cup of Bleſſing.* || It ſeems it was a Cuſtom of the Church to uſe this Doxology, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghoſt.* Againſt this Form ſome objected, That the Words were not to be found in Scripture, and therefore ought not to be us'd. In anſwer to this, he tells them, That it was not neceſſary to reject all Cuſtoms that were not founded in Scripture and Apoſtolical Tradition. *For where do we find a Scripture for* ſigning *with the Croſs, and praying towards the Eaſt? What Saint has left us the Words of Invocation? We conſecrate the Water of Baptiſm, the Oil of*

---

* Matt. 14. 19. † Mark 8. 6, 7.

|| Τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ὅτι τῇ ἀναδείξει τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τῆς εὐλογίας, τίς ἁγίων ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν κατέλιπεν. Ad Amphilocium. *Cap.* 27.

Unction, and him alſo who is to be baptiz'd: but from what Writings? * Now, Sir, your Author muſt firſt prove, that ἐπίκλησις ſignifies the Invocation of the Holy Ghoſt, or elſe this Text is nothing to the purpoſe, and could this be prov'd, yet it would appear no more neceſſary than ſeveral other Cuſtoms that are not pleaded for, tho' they ſtand upon the ſame Foundation.

And *Laſtly*, Can it be prov'd neceſſary from the Reaſon of the Thing? Is the Sacrament invalid without this Form? Doth it confer no Benefit, on account of this pretended Defect, to the worthy Communicant? Has the Church of *England* receiv'd nothing but common Bread and Wine at the Altar, ever ſince the Reformation? This muſt be prov'd, and very fully too, before it will appear neceſſary, from the Nature of the Thing. It is very unlikely that we ſhould have none but a ſilent Tradition for it, and no written Inſtructions about it, had it been ſo eſſentially important.

Had our Church excluded the Form, by which our Saviour conſecrated the *Euchariſt*, you might have had ſome Ground of Complaint: But ſince the Conſecration Prayer contains the very Words which our Saviour made uſe of, and the Service is full of Prayers and Thankſgivings, I think your Complaint is unreaſonable, and I am ſure your Charge is groundleſs.

It has been the Opinion of ſeveral great Men, That the Apoſtles us'd only the Lord's Prayer, and the Words which our Saviour pronounc'd. † However, ſhould this be a Miſtake, yet there were many of the Fathers, who thought that the Bread and Wine became the *Euchariſt* upon the bare pronouncing, *This is my Body*, &c. Among many Inſtances, I ſhall only produce the Opinion of *Tertullian*. *The Bread which our Saviour took, and diſtributed to his Diſciples, he made his Body, by ſaying, This is my Body*; that is, the Figure of my Body. ‖

---

* Εὐλογέ ιν δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ τῦ βαπτίσματ⊙, ϗ τὸ ἔλαιον τῆς χρίσεως, ϗ πρόσθεν αὐτὸν τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, ἀπὸ ποίων ἐγγράφων. Ibid.

† Vide Caſſiandri Epiſt. ad Henric. Baers.

‖ Acceptum panem & diſtributum diſcipulis, corpus ſuum illum fecit, *hoc eſt Corpus meum* dicendo, id eſt, figura corporis mei. *Adverſ. Marcion. Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 40.

The

The learned Monſieur *Goar* * has largely proved that the Conſecration is not perform'd by the invocating the Holy Ghoſt, or by any other Prayers. And beſides the School-men, there are numberleſs valuable Authors who are of this Opinion. Nay, 'tis plain, that it is the Senſe not only of the Church of *England*, but of the whole *Weſtern* Church. And till I ſee better Reaſons than hitherto I have met with, I ſhall not differ from them. After all, ſuppoſe that the Church ſhould be miſtaken, in thinking that the recital of our Saviour's Words is all that is Eſſential to the Form of Conſecration; yet it doth not appear that this Addition, which you require, is neceſſary. For the learned Mr. *Thorndike*, (tho' he was of Opinion that the force of the Conſecration doth not depend upon the recital of our Saviour's Words, and cites all the Fathers which your Author produces for this Purpoſe; †) yet was entirely ſatisfied with the Office of our Communion Service. Nay, upon his own Principles, he grants that the Lord's Prayer ſaid over the Elements, with an intention to make the Euchariſt, would effectually make them ſo. His Words are theſe: *For that Aſſembly, which, believing that Chriſtians are juſtified by undertaking to profeſs the Faith, and to live according to it, and that our Lord hath left us his Body and Blood of the Euchariſt, to convey the Holy Ghoſt to our Souls, that they may be able to perform what they undertake, ſhould pray the Lord's Prayer over the Elements propos'd, with that intent; I cannot doubt of their receiving the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* ‖

The laſt Thing, which, as yet, is demanded, is the Reſtoration of the Oblatory Prayer, which in the firſt reform'd Liturgy, at the End of the Conſecration Prayer, ſtands thus. *Wherefore O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the Inſtitution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, we thy humble Servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majeſty, with theſe thy holy Gifts, the Memorial which thy Son hath will'd us to make; having in Remembrance his bleſſed Paſſion, mighty Reſurrection, and glorious Aſcenſion, rendring unto thee moſt hearty thanks for the innumerable Benefits procured unto us by the ſame, entirely deſiring thy Fatherly Goodneſs,* &c. As the Prayer goes on in the Poſt-Communion of our preſent Liturgy.

For my own part, I have no Objection againſt this Form, were it inſerted in our Liturgy by a competent Authority. Nor do I ſee any reaſon to differ from your learned Author in his Notion of the Euchariſtick Sacrifice. But why this Prayer ſhould be made one of the Terms of Communion, or be ſo ſtrenuouſly inſiſted on at this time, I can't tell. For the Notion of a Sacrifice don't infer the Neceſſity of it. And 'tis very plain our Saviour gave the Sacrament to his Diſciples without making uſe of ſuch a Prayer as this. * And ſince our Saviour's Death, has any of his Apoſtles left us a Command to make uſe of ſuch a Prayer, before the receiving of the Euchariſt? Have we any early Tradition for it? Or

---

* Euchologion. *Pag.* 140. *&c.*
† Epilog. *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 4. ‖ *Lib.* 3. *Pag.* 30.
* *Matt.* 26. *Mark* 14. *Luke* 22. 1 *Cor.* 11.

doth it appear ſo plainly, to be abſolutely neceſſary from the nature of the Thing? Did the learned *Joſeph Mead* and Dr. *Hicks*, who look'd as far into the Caſe as any that pretend to be ſo ſcrupulous now, make it a term of Communion, or even refuſe the Sacrament where the Oblatory Prayer was not uſed? And to conclude, has the learned Mr. *Johnſon*, ſince he has publiſhed his laſt Will, † quitted the Church of *England*?

How deſirable ſoever theſe Gentlemen might think the Oblatory Prayer, yet it is plain from their *Practice* they did not think it abſolutely neceſſary. And therefore what your Author has cited from them, I ſhall beg leave to ſay comes far ſhort of his Purpoſe.

Thus, Sir, I think I have clear'd the Church of *England* from the heavy Charge you are pleas'd to lay againſt her in your Letter. And have ventur'd to anſwer the Two Books which you call unanſwerable. You boaſt that you have the Judgment of Antiquity on your Side, for the Four Things which you demand. If you mean that the Ancients thought theſe Things Lawful, I ſee no reaſon to differ from you. And, if you pleaſe, I will give you a Liſt of Fourſcore ancient lawful Cuſtoms, which few Churches now think fit to Practice. And yet they were more neceſſary *then* than what you demand can be *now*. For tho' theſe things were all of them indifferent in their own Nature, yet the Authority that commanded them was competent, and that is more than can be pleaded by you, ſuppoſing what you demand were more uſeful to the Church, and every Member of it, than they really are.

The Local Cuſtoms and Conſtitution of a Church are not to be alter'd, without the greateſt Caution and utmoſt Deliberation. The Attempt ſeems too daring, were there any apparent Majority of the Church of *England* for it. But when a few, a very inconſiderable Number, ſhall not only make the Attempt in an undue manner but ſhall —— I can't blame the World for beſtowing that Epithet upon them that I don't care to name.

In ſhort, Sir, the Caſe is plainly this. Either you or the Church of *England* are Schiſmaticks. For your Separation, to the Grief of all good Men, is now become open, and the diſguiſe of old Church of *England* Men is thrown off. That the Articles which you demand to be reſtor'd are not Eſſential and abſolutely neceſſary, I think I have fully prov'd. And if a dozen warm Men can't ſtand an Authority upon indifferent things, your Separation from the Church of *England* is not only unreaſonable, but, if there is any Danger in Schiſm, very hazardous to the Souls of thoſe that adhere to it.

† *Vide* Defence. *Page* 113.

FINIS.

N. B. *For* Arminian *Read* Armenian.